

PATENT
IBM Docket No. JP920000247US1

REMARKS

The claims have been amended by introducing new limitations into independent claims 1, 5, 6, 7, 10, and 13, and further cancelling claims 11, and 14. Claims 1, 3-7, 10, and 13 remain in the application.

As discussed in an interview with the Examiner on January 23, 2004, Applicants respectfully seek entry of this amendment to advance the prosecution of this case. Applicants respectfully request that the rejection of the claims presented be reconsidered and withdrawn in light of the amendments above and the discussion which follows and that the application be found in condition for immediate allowance. This amendment could not have been earlier presented because new art, never before Applicants, was cited by the examiner.

Drawings

The Examiner has required new corrected drawings because the changes made were not made on a separate paper in red ink. In response, Applicants have complied by including two corrected drawing sheets: one in final form without markings of any kind and labeled "*Replacement Sheet*," and the other showing the changes made in red ink and labeled "*Annotated Marked-up Drawings*." Applicants believe this is the proper manner to comply with the Examiner's requirement as per the July 30, 2003 revised amendment practice, details of which can be found in the Federal Register at 68 FR 38611 through 68 FR 38630. Note that in this revised amendment practice, a separate letter to the draftsman is not indicated. Should the Examiner find a URL more convenient than the Federal Register reference, or, should the Examiner wish to see PTO papers which Applicants have used as reference, Applicants offer the following URL which was still active at the time of this writing:

SN: 09/978,519

- 8 -

PATENT
IBM Docket No. JP920000247US1

<http://www.uspto.gov/web/offices/pac/dapp/opla/preognotice/textsection2.htm> .

The 35 USC §112 Rejections

Applicants acknowledge with appreciation the comments of the Examiner in the Official Action. The amendments made hereinabove are intended to correct the deficiency of the claims amended under 35 USC 112 and to bring the application into condition for immediate allowance, which is respectfully solicited.

Claim 10 stands rejected as lacking antecedent basis for ~~—said housing—~~ in the phrase *"vertical to said housing"*. In response, Applicants have replaced this language with *"in a ... vertical orientation"* language. Claim 10 now reads:

... a holding member, coupled to said connection enhancement apparatus, which holds the portable information processing apparatus in a closed position and a substantially vertical to ~~said housing~~ orientation and in connection with said connection enhancement apparatus.

Claim 13 stands rejected as lacking antecedent basis for ~~—the installation surface—~~ in the phrase *"an initial position parallel to the installation surface"*. In response, Applicants have replaced this language with *"an initial horizontal position."* Claim 13 now reads:

... wherein said rotatable member is rotatably movable from an initial horizontal position ~~parallel to the installation surface~~ to the installed vertical position and supports the portable information processing apparatus in a closed position.

Support for ~~—initial horizontal position—~~ can be found at least in Figure 16. Therefore, Applicants' believe no new matter has been introduced.

SN: 09/978,519

- 9 -

PATENT
IBM Docket No. JP920000247US1

The 35 USC §102 Rejections

All Claims stand rejected as anticipated by the disclosure of Thompson, United States Patent 6,490,154 (hereinafter "Thompson"). In response, Applicants requested an interview with the Examiner and have amended the claims accordingly and believe the application is now in condition for allowance.

Summary of Interview with the Examiner

A telephonic interview was granted by the Examiner on January 23, 2004. Applicants' would firstly like to express their deepest gratitude toward the Examiner for allowing the interview in the first place. Applicants' understand that the Examiner was pressured for time when contacted regarding the interview request. Nevertheless, the Examiner kindly worked it in to her busy schedule. A summary of the interview follows.

On January 23, 2004, an interview was conducted between the undersigned and Examiner Lisa Lea-Edmonds. Applicants proposed either of two lines of reasoning and corresponding amendments which Applicants believed to distinguish over the cited art and move the application to allowance. Applicants proposed that if the Examiner agreed to either one, Applicants would make such amendment to all independent claims and seek immediate allowance rather than argue the case in appeal or in further prosecution via RCE.

The first line of reasoning/amendment offered was based on allowability due to the display being attached to the housing rather than to the processing unit, as in rejected claim 3.

SN: 09/978,519

- 10 -

PATENT
IBM Docket No. JP920000247US1

The second line of reasoning/amendment offered was based on allowability due to a limitation to be added to all independent claims that the information processing apparatus (laptop) be closed. With this limitation, all of the references cited (whether applied or not) would fail to operate and clearly do not anticipate the claims.

The Examiner preferred the second line of reasoning and amendment. Therefore, Applicants have adopted the second line of reasoning and amendment. Support for the laptop in the closed position was identified during the interview in at least Figures 1-6. Figure 7 shows that the laptop can open.

The drawings and other issues related to a swift allowance were discussed and the interview drew to a close shortly thereafter.

Conclusion

Every effort has been made to place this application in condition for allowance. Applicants respectfully request that this response be considered and entered.

In view of the foregoing, it is believed that this case has been placed in condition for a Notice of Allowability and early notice to that effect is earnestly solicited. Should the Examiner wish to have a telephonic discussion of the made herein, the courtesy of a telephone call prior to any forthcoming rejection would be greatly appreciated.

SN: 09/978,519

- 11 -

PATENT
IBM Docket No. JP920000247US1

Respectfully Submitted,



Carlos Munoz-Bustamante

Reg. No. 51,349

IBM Corporation
Personal and Printing Systems Group
Intellectual Property Law
Department 9CCA/Building 002-2
P. O. Box 12195
Research Triangle Park, NC 27709

(919)254-2587
FAX: 919-254-2649
EMAIL: cbustama@us.ibm.com

SN: 09/978,519

- 12 -